Vat vmc

LGL-1-9

YOUR FILE NO. 1800 1583

OUR FILE NO. 1708

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

FOREST ENTOMOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY BRANCH

FEB 5 1962

FOREST ENTOMOLOGY AND
PATHOLOGY LABORATORY,
409 FEDERAL BUILDING,
VICTORIA, B.C.

February 2, 1962.

Mr. R.L. Furniss, Chief,
Div. of Forest Insect Research,
U.S.D.A. Forest Service,
809 N.E. Sixth Avenue,
P.O. Box 4059,
Portland 8, Oregon.

Dear Bob:

Subject: Spruce Budworm

Thank you very much for your kind comments on the two-year cycle spruce budworm report recently sent to you. I hope you found it both interesting and useful.

Tom Silver has offered some comments with respect to the question raised in the third paragraph of your letter. According to Tom there is some mixing of one-year and two-year cycle budworm but he feels that there is little that can be done to define the amount of mixing more clearly. For instance, even in the northern regions where we feel certain that there is no one-year cycle budworm a small percentage of the two-year cycle is out of phase. The percentage is small, estimated by some at less than one per cent, but at high population levels even one in a thousand represents sufficient numbers to turn up in collections. This, therefore, brings up the question of whether the pupae or mature larvae collected in the southern regions in out of phase years are one- or two-year cycle budworms. From the survey point of view we feel that the problem does not warrant further effort unless the percentage of out of phase budworms or one-year cycle strain increases to a quantity large enough to affect our sampling or appraisal of population trends.

RLF.

Yours sincerely,

Ray

R.R. Lejeune,
Officer-in-Charge.

RRL/EW